

1 Robert W. Boatman (009619)
2 Paul L. Stoller (016773)
3 Shannon L. Clark (019708)
4 GALLAGHER & KENNEDY, P.A.
5 2575 East Camelback Road
6 Phoenix, Arizona 85016-9225
7 Telephone: (602) 530-8000
8 rwb@gknet.com
9 paul.stoller@gknet.com
10 SLC@gknet.com
11 Ramon Rossi Lopez (CA Bar No. 86361)
12 (admitted *pro hac vice*)
13 LOPEZ McHUGH LLP
14 100 Bayview Circle, Suite 5600
15 Newport Beach, California 92660
16 rlopez@lopezmchugh.com
17 *Co-Lead/Liaison Counsel for Plaintiffs*

18 James R. Condo (#005867)
19 Amanda C. Sheridan (#027360)
20 SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.
21 One Arizona Center
22 400 E. Van Buren, Suite 1900
23 Phoenix, Arizona 85004-2202
24 Telephone: 602.382.6000
25 Facsimile: 602.382.6070
26 jcondo@swlaw.com
27 asheridan@swlaw.com
28 Richard B. North, Jr. (admitted *pro hac vice*)
Georgia Bar No. 545599

Matthew B. Lerner (admitted *pro hac vice*)
Georgia Bar No. 446986
NELSON MULLINS RILEY & SCARBOROUGH LLP
201 17th Street, NW / Suite 1700
Atlanta, GA 30363
Telephone: (404) 322-6000
Telephone: (602) 382-6000
richard.north@nelsonmullins.com
matthew.lerner@nelsonmullins.com
*Attorneys for Defendants C. R. Bard, Inc. and
Bard Peripheral Vascular, Inc.*

22
23 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
24
25 FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

26
27
28 IN RE: Bard IVC Filters Products
Liability Litigation,

No. 2:15-MD-02641-DGC
JOINT ESI STATUS REPORT

1 On August 31 and September 7, 2016, the Court held conference calls with the
2 Parties concerning the status of ESI. During the September 7, 2016 status call—and in a
3 Minute Entry of the same day—the Court noted that the Parties had reached agreement on
4 the ESI process, ordered that Defendants' production be completed by September 30, 2016,
5 and ordered the Parties to provide the Court with a brief status report of the status of ESI
6 by September 23, 2016. In accordance with the Court's instructions, the Parties provide
7 the following ESI status report:

8 To expedite document production of ESI from Defendants, the Parties agreed to a
9 process by which Defendants would produce documents primarily without “eyes-on”
10 review for relevancy while still performing a privilege review. As part of that process, on
11 September 9, the Parties submitted a proposed case management order (“CMO”) regarding
12 the protection of information and redaction of materials from Defendants’ expedited ESI
13 production. The Court entered the CMO on that subject on September 14. The parties have
14 subsequently engaged in negotiation regarding clarification of that CMO to make clear the
15 parties’ intent that the order does not require Plaintiffs to identify or describe the specific
16 intended use for any document or file that they notify Defendants they “intend to use”
17 pursuant to paragraph 4 of the CMO, e.g., Plaintiffs are not required to identify documents
18 before use at depositions. The parties are negotiating the particular language of the
19 clarification and intend to submit a proposed amended CMO by early next week.

20 Since the August 31 conference call, Defendants have collected and processed
21 terabytes of data from custodial and shared data sources. In addition, Defendants have, on
22 a rolling basis, produced hundreds of thousands of pages of documents and anticipate
23 producing hundreds of thousands of additional documents over the next week.

24 Since the September 7, 2016 status conference, the Parties have continued to work
25 cooperatively on ESI issues. They have agreed on search parameters using identified and
26 agreed keyword and fuzzy terms (subject to discussion as to whether there may need to be
27 some discrete additional terms run against the resulting non-responsive set) and are
28 producing documents using those terms; with the exception some specific folders from the

1 already-collected shared server locations which they are actively discussing, they have
 2 agreed on all sources and locations of ESI from which ESI is to be produced and are
 3 producing from those sources; and, they have agreed on the general parameters for testing
 4 of documents that did not hit on the agreed-upon keyword or fuzzy terms and are continuing
 5 to negotiate the specifics of such testing.

6 While the Parties continue to work cooperatively on this matter, in the event the
 7 Parties are unable to resolve any of the remaining issues, they will contact the Court to
 8 determine how it wants to resolve any such impasse.

9 DATED this 23rd day of September, 2016.

10 GALLAGHER & KENNEDY, P.A.

 SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.

11

12 By: s/ Paul L. Stoller

13 Robert W. Boatman (009619)
 14 Paul L. Stoller (016773)
 15 Shannon L. Clark (019708)
 16 2575 East Camelback Road
 17 Phoenix, Arizona 85016-9225

18

19 Ramon Rossi Lopez
 20 (admitted *pro hac vice*)
 21 CA Bar No. 86361
 22 LOPEZ McHUGH LLP
 23 100 Bayview Circle, Suite 5600
 24 Newport Beach, California 92660
 25 Attorneys for Plaintiffs

26

11 By: s/ Matthew B. Lerner

12 James R. Condo
 13 Amanda C. Sheridan
 14 One Arizona Center
 15 400 E. Van Buren, Suite 1900
 16 Phoenix, Arizona 85004-2202

17

18 Richard B. North, Jr. (admitted *pro hac*
 19 vice)
 20 Georgia Bar No. 545599
 21 Matthew B. Lerner (admitted *pro hac*
 22 vice)
 23 Georgia Bar No. 446986
 24 Nelson Mullins Riley & Scarborough
 25 LLP
 26 201 17th Street, NW / Suite 1700
 27 Atlanta, GA 30363
 28 Attorneys for C. R. Bard, Inc. and Bard
 Peripheral Vascular, Inc.

29

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

30

31 I hereby certify that on September 23, 2016, the foregoing was electronically filed
 32 with the Clerk of Court using the CM/ECF system which will automatically send email
 33 notification of such filing to all attorneys of record.

34

35

36 s/ Deborah Yanazzo

37 Deborah Yanazzo

38